

**PY 2011 Customer Satisfaction Survey of Participants  
Nationwide Report  
November 19, 2012**

**I. Overview**

The nationwide report for the PY 2011 participant customer satisfaction surveys consists of the tables below that present the nationwide scores for all of the survey questions, as well as the standard analyses, Key Drivers and Questions Most Closely Associated with ACSI Scores, in Section II K. Other than the driver analysis on pages 17-18, the usual narrative explanation has been omitted.

This nationwide report will be most useful if read in conjunction with the complete nationwide participant survey report for PY 2009. The PY 2009 nationwide report contains the background of the participant customer satisfaction survey project, the methodology employed by all grantees, an explanation of the nationwide results for each survey question, and an extended explanation of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI).

**II. Survey Results**

**A. Demographic and Service History**

Table 1

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Race	White	5884	52.3%
		Black	3819	34.0%
		Asian	642	5.7%
		American Indian	448	4.0%
		Pacific Islander	29	.3%
		Did not volunteer	422	3.8%
	Gender	Male	4146	36.1%
		Female	7323	63.8%
		Did not volunteer	11	.1%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	1097	9.8%
		Not Hispanic	9751	86.8%
		Did not volunteer	387	3.4%
	Education	Less than HS Diploma	2587	22.9%
		HS Diploma or GED	4379	38.8%
		Some college	2468	21.9%
		Vocational/technical degree	187	1.7%
		Associates degree	320	2.8%
		BA/BS	911	8.1%
		Bachelor's plus	421	3.7%

			Count	Percent	
State Grantees	Race	White	7524	59.3%	
		Black	3802	30.0%	
		Asian	439	3.5%	
		American Indian	444	3.5%	
		Pacific Islander	100	.8%	
		Did not volunteer	379	3.0%	
	Gender	Male	3932	30.3%	
		Female	9022	69.6%	
		Did not volunteer	14	.1%	
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	911	7.2%	
		Not Hispanic	11322	89.2%	
		Did not volunteer	458	3.6%	
	Education	Less than HS Diploma	2383	18.8%	
		HS Diploma or GED	5161	40.7%	
		Some college	2901	22.9%	
		Vocational/technical degree	296	2.3%	
		Associates degree	390	3.1%	
		BA/BS	1075	8.5%	
		Bachelor's plus	486	3.8%	
	Nationwide	Race	White	13408	56.0%
			Black	7621	31.8%
Asian			1081	4.5%	
American Indian			892	3.7%	
Pacific Islander			129	.5%	
Did not volunteer			801	3.3%	
Gender		Male	8078	33.0%	
		Female	16345	66.9%	
		Did not volunteer	25	.1%	
Ethnicity		Hispanic	2008	8.4%	
		Not Hispanic	21073	88.1%	
		Did not volunteer	845	3.5%	
Education		Less than HS Diploma	4970	20.7%	
		HS Diploma or GED	9540	39.8%	
		Some college	5369	22.4%	
		Vocational/technical degree	483	2.0%	
		Associates degree	710	3.0%	
		BA/BS	1986	8.3%	
		Bachelor's plus	907	3.8%	

Table 2

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Less than 65	7916	68.9%
	65 and older	3565	31.1%
State Grantees	Less than 65	8561	66.1%
	65 and older	4397	33.9%
Nationwide	Less than 65	16477	67.4%
	65 and older	7962	32.6%

Table 3

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Seventy-five or Older	No	10864	94.6%
		Yes	621	5.4%
	Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness	No	8049	70.1%
		Yes	3437	29.9%
	Poor Employment Prospects	No	1325	11.8%
		Yes	9946	88.2%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIA Services	No	8137	84.0%
		Yes	1550	16.0%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	No	7025	79.3%
		Yes	1837	20.7%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	No	8719	97.3%
		Yes	238	2.7%
	Veteran	Not a veteran	9716	87.3%
		Veteran	1409	12.7%
	Disability	No	8807	79.2%
		Yes	2309	20.8%
	Severe Disability	No	8798	98.1%
		Yes	172	1.9%
	Frail	No	8904	99.1%
		Yes	83	.9%
LEP	No	9845	87.3%	
	Yes	1430	12.7%	
Low Literacy Skills	No	8842	78.5%	
	Yes	2418	21.5%	
Urban/Rural	Urban	7750	68.8%	
	Rural	3520	31.2%	

			Count	Percent
State Grantees	Seventy-five or Older	No	12202	94.1%
		Yes	766	5.9%
	Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness	No	10311	79.5%
		Yes	2657	20.5%
	Poor Employment Prospects	No	3393	26.7%
		Yes	9300	73.3%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIA Services	No	9094	80.2%
		Yes	2248	19.8%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	No	8231	78.6%
		Yes	2246	21.4%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	No	10396	97.1%
		Yes	307	2.9%
	Veteran	Not a veteran	10993	86.6%
		Veteran	1697	13.4%
	Disability	No	9972	78.6%
		Yes	2719	21.4%
	Severe Disability	No	10394	97.0%
		Yes	325	3.0%
	Frail	No	10585	98.6%
		Yes	147	1.4%
LEP	No	11912	93.9%	
	Yes	776	6.1%	
Low Literacy Skills	No	11054	87.1%	
	Yes	1640	12.9%	
Urban/Rural	Urban	7859	61.9%	
	Rural	4835	38.1%	
Nationwide	Seventy-five or Older	No	23066	94.3%
		Yes	1387	5.7%
	Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness	No	18360	75.1%
		Yes	6094	24.9%
	Poor Employment Prospects	No	4718	19.7%
		Yes	19246	80.3%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIA Services	No	17231	81.9%
		Yes	3798	18.1%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	No	15256	78.9%
		Yes	4083	21.1%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	No	19115	97.2%
		Yes	545	2.8%

			Count	Percent
	Veteran	Not a veteran	20709	87.0%
		Veteran	3106	13.0%
	Disability	No	18779	78.9%
		Yes	5028	21.1%
	Severe Disability	No	19192	97.5%
		Yes	497	2.5%
	Frail	No	19489	98.8%
		Yes	230	1.2%
	LEP	No	21757	90.8%
		Yes	2206	9.2%
	Low Literacy Skills	No	19896	83.1%
		Yes	4058	16.9%
	Urban/Rural	Urban	15609	65.1%
		Rural	8355	34.9%

Table 4

	Number of Barriers per Participant			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	7729	2.6	0	8
State Grantees	9249	2.4	0	10
Nationwide	16078	2.5	0	10

Table 5

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Duration to Exit in Days	4581	478.0	0	6618
	Number of Assignments	11486	1.7	1	11
State Grantees	Duration to Exit in Days	5208	574.6	0	8991
	Number of Assignments	12968	1.5	1	11
Nationwide	Duration to Exit in Days	9789	529.4	0	8991
	Number of Assignments	24454	1.6	1	11

Table 6

Exit Reason		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Regular employment	1542	13.4%
	Self-employment	91	.8%
	Other reason	2948	25.7%
	Did not exit	6905	60.1%
State Grantees	Regular employment	1639	12.6%
	Self-employment	91	.7%
	Other reason	3478	26.8%
	Did not exit	7760	59.8%
Nationwide	Regular employment	3181	13.0%
	Self-employment	182	.7%
	Other reason	6426	26.3%
	Did not exit	14665	60.0%

B. Response Rate

Table 7

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	847	52.6%	763	47.4%
ANPPM	219	59.3%	150	40.7%
Easter Seals	281	57.3%	209	42.7%
Experience Works	1419	65.4%	751	34.6%
Goodwill	217	51.7%	203	48.3%
IID	181	63.7%	103	36.3%
Mature Services	234	63.2%	136	36.8%
ABLE	247	66.8%	123	33.2%
NAPCA	297	60.6%	193	39.4%
NCBA	425	67.5%	205	32.5%
NCOA	440	57.1%	330	42.9%
NICOA	267	61.8%	165	38.2%
Urban League	222	52.9%	198	47.1%
QCS	197	58.3%	141	41.7%
SER	343	61.3%	217	38.8%
SSAI	683	61.0%	437	39.0%
VATD	185	59.1%	128	40.9%
TWI	197	59.7%	133	40.3%

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
National Grantees	6901	60.1%	4585	39.9%
Alabama	244	65.9%	126	34.1%
Alaska	140	37.8%	230	62.2%
Arizona	214	62.9%	126	37.1%
Arkansas	169	65.0%	91	35.0%
California	210	56.8%	160	43.2%
Colorado	95	59.7%	64	40.3%
Connecticut	121	53.3%	106	46.7%
Delaware	199	53.8%	171	46.2%
District of Columbia	68	56.2%	53	43.8%
Florida	215	58.1%	155	41.9%
Georgia	236	63.8%	134	36.2%
Hawaii	225	63.6%	129	36.4%
Idaho	46	66.7%	23	33.3%
Illinois	230	62.2%	140	37.8%
Indiana	228	61.6%	142	38.4%
Iowa	112	61.5%	70	38.5%
Kansas	62	53.4%	54	46.6%
Kentucky	229	72.7%	86	27.3%
Louisiana	158	56.8%	120	43.2%
Maine	59	60.8%	38	39.2%
Maryland	131	65.2%	70	34.8%
Massachusetts	224	60.5%	146	39.5%
Michigan	247	66.8%	123	33.2%
Minnesota	246	66.5%	124	33.5%
Mississippi	118	67.4%	57	32.6%
Missouri	212	57.3%	158	42.7%
Montana	79	68.1%	37	31.9%
Nebraska	70	53.4%	61	46.6%
Nevada	61	58.1%	44	41.9%
New Hampshire	79	55.2%	64	44.8%
New Jersey	251	67.8%	119	32.2%
New Mexico	66	54.5%	55	45.5%
New York	214	57.8%	156	42.2%
North Carolina	254	69.0%	114	31.0%
North Dakota	61	56.0%	48	44.0%
Ohio	195	52.7%	175	47.3%

	Response Rate			
	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Oklahoma	158	58.7%	111	41.3%
Oregon	172	62.1%	105	37.9%
Pennsylvania	259	70.4%	109	29.6%
Rhode Island	50	58.8%	35	41.2%
South Carolina	131	53.5%	114	46.5%
South Dakota	76	61.8%	47	38.2%
Tennessee	184	60.1%	122	39.9%
Texas	246	66.5%	124	33.5%
Utah	76	64.4%	42	35.6%
Vermont	46	64.8%	25	35.2%
Virginia	243	66.0%	125	34.0%
Washington	153	66.5%	77	33.5%
West Virginia	104	63.8%	59	36.2%
Wisconsin	216	58.4%	154	41.6%
Wyoming	39	57.4%	29	42.6%
State Grantees	7921	61.1%	5047	38.9%
Nationwide	14822	60.6%	9632	39.4%

### C. American Customer Satisfaction Index

Table 8

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	847	79.3	0	100
ANPPM	219	82.3	0	100
Easter Seals	281	80.0	0	100
Experience Works	1419	80.5	0	100
Goodwill	217	78.4	0	100
IID	181	88.7	0	100
Mature Services	234	79.3	0	100
ABLE	247	78.8	0	100
NAPCA	297	81.9	22	100
NCBA	425	82.7	0	100
NCOA	440	81.1	0	100
NICOA	267	82.9	0	100
Urban League	222	80.4	0	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
QCS	197	79.3	0	100
SER	343	78.8	0	100
SSAI	683	82.0	0	100
VATD	185	73.1	0	100
TWI	197	80.6	0	100
National Grantees	6901	80.6	0	100
Alabama	244	87.3	0	100
Alaska	140	76.3	0	100
Arizona	214	72.3	0	100
Arkansas	169	83.4	0	100
California	210	79.0	0	100
Colorado	95	78.8	0	100
Connecticut	121	77.3	0	100
Delaware	199	86.6	0	100
District of Columbia	68	82.9	0	100
Florida	215	80.1	5	100
Georgia	236	80.2	0	100
Hawaii	225	88.7	0	100
Idaho	46	70.2	0	100
Illinois	230	79.2	0	100
Indiana	228	80.3	0	100
Iowa	112	79.2	4	100
Kansas	62	80.7	0	100
Kentucky	229	85.2	0	100
Louisiana	158	84.8	0	100
Maine	59	76.4	15	100
Maryland	131	83.5	0	100
Massachusetts	224	79.0	0	100
Michigan	247	79.5	0	100
Minnesota	246	83.6	3	100
Mississippi	118	86.3	0	100
Missouri	212	83.6	0	100
Montana	79	72.9	0	100
Nebraska	70	83.1	10	100
Nevada	61	82.2	0	100
New Hampshire	79	75.5	0	100
New Jersey	251	81.0	0	100
New Mexico	66	85.4	20	100

	ACSI			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
New York	214	82.6	0	100
North Carolina	254	86.0	0	100
North Dakota	61	81.1	0	100
Ohio	195	78.4	0	100
Oklahoma	158	89.5	0	100
Oregon	172	68.0	0	100
Pennsylvania	259	80.0	6	100
Rhode Island	50	77.9	0	100
South Carolina	131	82.3	0	100
South Dakota	76	79.3	0	100
Tennessee	184	85.7	0	100
Texas	246	83.3	0	100
Utah	76	79.0	0	100
Vermont	46	67.7	0	100
Virginia	243	88.2	0	100
Washington	153	80.8	0	100
West Virginia	104	88.0	12	100
Wisconsin	216	79.1	0	100
Wyoming	39	79.7	4	100
State Grantees	7921	81.5	0	100
Nationwide	14822	81.1	0	100

#### D. Treatment by Sub-grantee

Table 9

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff told me everything I needed to know about how the program worked.	7118	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff understood my employment interests and needs.	7101	8.5	1	10
	11. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	6893	8.5	1	10

State Grantees	4. The Older Worker Program staff told me everything I needed to know about how the program worked.	8144	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff understood my employment interests and needs.	8118	8.6	1	10
	11. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	7878	8.6	1	10
Nationwide	4. The Older Worker Program staff told me everything I needed to know about how the program worked.	15262	8.7	1	10
	5. The Older Worker Program staff understood my employment interests and needs.	15219	8.5	1	10
	11. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	14771	8.6	1	10

## E. Supportive Services and Training

Table 10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	6. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	5043	6.5	1	10
	7. Before your community service assignment with your host agency, how much of the training you needed to meet your employment goals did the Older Worker Program give you?	5922	6.7	1	10
	12. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	6435	8.1	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
State Grantees	6. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	5613	7.0	1	10
	7. Before your community service assignment with your host agency, how much of the training you needed to meet your employment goals did the Older Worker Program give you?	6433	6.6	1	10
	12. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	7138	8.1	1	10
Nationwide	6. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	10656	6.8	1	10
	7. Before your community service assignment with your host agency, how much of the training you needed to meet your employment goals did the Older Worker Program give you?	12355	6.7	1	10
	12. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	13573	8.1	1	10

## F. Host Agency Assignment

Table 11

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	8. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain a community service assignment that was just right for me.	6881	8.4	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	9. I understand that I have the right to ask for a different community service assignment if I don't like the one the Older Worker Program gave me.	6772	8.6	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my community service assignment.	6875	8.8	1	10
State Grantees	8. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain a community service assignment that was just right for me.	7863	8.5	1	10
	9. I understand that I have the right to ask for a different community service assignment if I don't like the one the Older Worker Program gave me.	7505	8.6	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my community service assignment.	7873	8.8	1	10
Nationwide	8. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain a community service assignment that was just right for me.	14744	8.4	1	10
	9. I understand that I have the right to ask for a different community service assignment if I don't like the one the Older Worker Program gave me.	14277	8.6	1	10
	13. I feel comfortable at my community service assignment.	14748	8.8	1	10

Table 12

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	10. Given your transportation situation, was your community service assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	6125 87.4%
		No	628 9.0%
		Don't know	259 3.7%
	17. During my community service assignment, the Older Worker Program pressured me, before I was ready, to leave my community service assignment for unsubsidized employment.	Yes	963 13.7%
		No	5246 74.9%
		Don't know	796 11.4%

State Grantees	10. Given your transportation situation, was your community service assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	7052	88.0%
		No	668	8.3%
		Don't know	294	3.7%
	17. During my community service assignment, the Older Worker Program pressured me, before I was ready, to leave my community service assignment for unsubsidized employment.	Yes	968	12.1%
		No	6162	76.7%
		Don't know	903	11.2%
Nationwide	10. Given your transportation situation, was your community service assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	13177	87.7%
		No	1296	8.6%
		Don't know	553	3.7%
	17. During my community service assignment, the Older Worker Program pressured me, before I was ready, to leave my community service assignment for unsubsidized employment.	Yes	1931	12.8%
		No	11408	75.9%
		Don't know	1699	11.3%

## G. Impact of SCSEP on Participant Wellbeing

Table 13

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?	Better	2007	28.8%
		Worse	624	9.0%
		About the same	4333	62.2%
	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	219	3.1%
		A little more negative	355	5.1%
		About the same	1411	20.2%
		A little more positive	1791	25.6%
		Much more positive	3211	46.0%

		Count	Percent
State Grantees	14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?	Better	2347 29.5%
		Worse	700 8.8%
		About the same	4906 61.7%
	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	276 3.5%
		A little more negative	435 5.4%
		About the same	1647 20.6%
		A little more positive	2033 25.5%
		Much more positive	3596 45.0%
	Nationwide	14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?	Better
Worse			1324 8.9%
About the same			9239 61.9%
15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?		Much more negative	495 3.3%
		A little more negative	790 5.3%
		About the same	3058 20.4%
		A little more positive	3824 25.5%
		Much more positive	6807 45.5%

Table 14

	16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program has made a substantial difference in the quality of my life.			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	7009	7.6	1	10
State Grantees	8043	7.6	1	10
Nationwide	15052	7.6	1	10

## H. Unsubsidized Employment

Table 15

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	18. How much help did Older Worker Program staff give you in finding an unsubsidized job?	3118	7.0	1	10

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	19. How much of the skills and training you need for your current job did you gain from your community service assignment?	3053	6.5	1	10
	20. Overall, how helpful was your community service assignment(s) in preparing you for success in your current unsubsidized job?	2980	7.3	1	10
State Grantees	18. How much help did Older Worker Program staff give you in finding an unsubsidized job?	3432	7.0	1	10
	19. How much of the skills and training you need for your current job did you gain from your community service assignment?	3373	6.4	1	10
	20. Overall, how helpful was your community service assignment(s) in preparing you for success in your current unsubsidized job?	3180	7.3	1	10
Nationwide	18. How much help did Older Worker Program staff give you in finding an unsubsidized job?	6550	7.0	1	10
	19. How much of the skills and training you need for your current job did you gain from your community service assignment?	6426	6.4	1	10
	20. Overall, how helpful was your community service assignment(s) in preparing you for success in your current unsubsidized job?	6160	7.3	1	10

## I. Would Recommend

Table 16

	21. Would you recommend the services of the Older Worker Program to other older workers?			
	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	6804	9.2	1	10
State Grantees	7763	9.2	1	10
Nationwide	14567	9.2	1	10

## J. Open-Ended Questions

The last two questions asked respondents to write what they felt was most valuable about the program and what they thought was most in need of improvement. Each grantee has received a CD with the comments that were included in the surveys completed by its participants.

## K. Key Drivers and Questions Most Closely Associated with ACSI Scores

### 1. Driver Analysis

The driver analysis is conducted to determine which aspects of service were most important to overall satisfaction. Table 17 presents those results. First, each of the questions regarding customer service was correlated independently to the ACSI. The results are in the last column and indicate the strength of the relationship (the correlation) between each question's responses and the ACSI (the closer to 1.0, the stronger the relationship), the statistical significance of the relationship (the closer to zero, the more likely the relationship would not have appeared by chance), and the number of observations in the analysis. (Only those respondents who answered the particular question under consideration and all three ACSI questions are included in the analysis.) Then the questions were analyzed together in a regression analysis in relation to the ACSI to see which questions made a significant, unique contribution to understanding what drives overall satisfaction over and above the contribution of any other questions.<sup>1</sup> This analysis narrowed the number of questions with a unique relationship to the ACSI to five, which are shaded in the table. Questions with only smaller correlations or that contribute little unique understanding to the ACSI are unshaded,<sup>2</sup> even if the individual correlation is relatively strong. The analysis presented in Table 17 is based on the nationwide response to each question. There was no significant difference between the responses for state grantees and national grantees.

Five questions are shaded as the most significant independent drivers of satisfaction (Questions 4, 5, 8, 13 and 16). Questions 4 and 5, dealing with participants' treatment by the sub-grantee, are extremely highly correlated with the ACSI and each has a strong, unique influence on the ACSI. The extremely large size of these correlations means that any change in these scores is likely to have a direct and independent change on overall satisfaction. These two questions are areas of great strength for the program: the scores for both are high. Continued attention to how participants are treated will help ensure high levels of satisfaction.

The third shaded driver, question 8, is also very important. It asks the participant to judge the degree to which the community service assignment was right for him or her. This question makes

---

<sup>1</sup> In the regression equation, the strongest driver for the ACSI, as determined by the correlations, is entered into the equation first. Other drivers are entered into the equation after the strongest, but they are only kept in the equation if they make a significant contribution over and above the previous driver.

<sup>2</sup> Correlations from .1-.3 are usually considered small, .3-.5 moderate, and above .5 large or strong (D. Kenny, 1987. *Statistics for the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Little, Brown, and Company, Boston).

a substantial, unique contribution to the ACS and has a very high correlation. Moreover, the respondents rated this aspect of the program 8.4, indicating there is still room for improvement.

Question 13, the fourth shaded driver, asks about the participant’s comfort at the community service assignment. Unlike question 8, participants rate the program moderately high on their comfort with the assignment (8.8), meaning this is an important aspect of the program to maintain but there is not great room for improvement.

Question 16, whether the pay makes a substantial difference in the participant’s quality of life, is not as strongly related to the ACSI; however, it makes a unique contribution to overall satisfaction. Moreover, although the sub-grantee have limited control over this factor, the low score (7.6) indicates that there is room for improvement, if not by raising pay rates, by maintaining the number of hours or providing adequate compensation for missed time. This is the first time this question has been a significant driver, perhaps because so many grantees had to reduce hours during PY 11. .

The remaining unshaded questions (6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 18 and 19) are all moderately or strongly correlated with overall satisfaction, but the correlations are somewhat smaller and they have smaller or little unique relationship to the ACSI. They nonetheless may still be important in individual instances. Many of these questions relate to and are subsumed by the shaded questions regarding how the staff treated the participant and the quality of the assignment. Put another way, sub-grantees that provide the right host agency assignment tend to give the participant the opportunity to request a different assignment and the participants who feel comfortable at the assignment tend to believe that there is someone they can talk to. Other questions remain important because they have very strong correlations and quite low scores. Questions 18 (7.0) and 19 (6.4), which relate to unsubsidized employment; question 7 (6.7), regarding training provided prior to assignment; and question 6 (6.8), regarding supportive services, are all areas that should not be neglected.

Table 17

		Relation to ACSI
4. The Older Worker Program staff told me everything I needed to know about how the program worked.	Pearson Correlation	.754**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	14680
5. The Older Worker Program staff understood my employment interests and needs.	Pearson Correlation	.771**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	14517
6. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	Pearson Correlation	.614**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	10152

		Relation to ACSI
7. Before your community service assignment with your host agency, how much of the training you needed to meet your employment goals did the Older Worker Program give you?	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.576** .000 11848
8. The Older Worker Program helped me obtain a community service assignment that was just right for me.	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.673** .000 14166
9. I understand that I have the right to ask for a different community service assignment if I don't like the one the Older Worker Program gave me.	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.545** .000 13647
11. There is someone in the Older Worker Program I can talk to when I need to.	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.661** .000 14210
12. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.621** .000 13062
13. I feel comfortable at my community service assignment.	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.596** .000 14203
16. The pay I receive from the Older Worker Program has made a substantial difference in the quality of my life.	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.520** .000 14431
18. How much help did Older Worker Program staff give you in finding an unsubsidized job?	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.576** .000 6119
19. How much of the skills and training you need for your current job did you gain from your community service assignment?	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.512** .000 6004
20. Overall, how helpful was your community service assignment(s) in preparing you for success in your current unsubsidized job?	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.625** .000 5736

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

## 2. Other Questions Related to Satisfaction

Table 18

	10. Given your transportation situation, was your community service assignment convenient to where you live?					
	Yes		No		Don't know	
	Count	ACSI Score	Count	ACSI Score	Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	5843	82.2	587	63.4	232	76.9
State Grantees	6773	83.0	629	66.2	270	77.0
Nationwide	12616	82.7	1216	64.8	502	77.0

Table 19

	14. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?					
	Better		Worse		About the same	
	Count	ACSI Score	Count	ACSI Score	Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	1887	87.7	593	66.3	4138	79.5
State Grantees	2245	88.7	671	67.6	4717	80.2
Nationwide	4132	88.2	1264	67.0	8855	79.9

Table 20

			ACSI	
			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	205	64.1
		A little more negative	349	64.2
		About the same	1329	69.2
		A little more positive	1715	79.6
		Much more positive	3092	89.3
State Grantees	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	257	62.0
		A little more negative	415	63.2
		About the same	1570	72.1
		A little more positive	1967	81.3
		Much more positive	3474	90.0
Nationwide	15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	462	63.0
		A little more negative	764	63.6
		About the same	2899	70.7
		A little more positive	3682	80.5
		Much more positive	6566	89.7

Table 21

	17. During my community service assignment, the Older Worker Program pressured me, before I was ready, to leave my community service assignment for unsubsidized employment.					
	Yes		No		Don't know	
	Count	ACSI Score	Count	ACSI Score	Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	913	66.3	5019	83.9	730	75.5
State Grantees	913	64.6	5925	84.9	847	76.8
Nationwide	1826	65.5	10944	84.4	1577	76.2

### 3. Participant Characteristics

Table 22

		ACSI	
		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Male	2250	80.2
	Female	4644	80.8
	Did not volunteer	5	83.9
State Grantees	Male	2176	79.4
	Female	5737	82.3
	Did not volunteer	8	83.0
Nationwide	Male	4426	79.8
	Female	10381	81.6
	Did not volunteer	13	83.4

Table 23

		ACSI	
		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Less than HS Diploma	1428	85.5
	HS Diploma or GED	2670	81.7
	Some college	1509	77.6
	Vocational/technical degree	118	83.5
	Associates degree	198	77.1
	BA/BS	583	75.8
	Bachelor's plus	266	69.8
State Grantees	Less than HS Diploma	1378	87.2
	HS Diploma or GED	3205	83.1
	Some college	1748	79.4

		ACSI	
		Count	ACSI Score
	Vocational/technical degree	193	76.4
	Associates degree	257	77.5
	BA/BS	647	74.0
	Bachelor's plus	314	72.7
Nationwide	Less than HS Diploma	2806	86.3
	HS Diploma or GED	5875	82.5
	Some college	3257	78.6
	Vocational/technical degree	311	79.1
	Associates degree	455	77.3
	BA/BS	1230	74.9
	Bachelor's plus	580	71.4

Table 24

			ACSI	
			Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Barriers	1.00 or none	336	80.6
		2.00	905	79.1
		3.00	1855	78.6
		4.00 or more	3805	81.9
State Grantees	Barriers	1.00 or none	504	81.7
		2.00	1016	80.5
		3.00	1983	80.4
		4.00 or more	4418	82.2
Nationwide	Barriers	1.00 or none	840	81.3
		2.00	1921	79.9
		3.00	3838	79.5
		4.00 or more	8223	82.1

Table 25

Exit Reason		ACSI	
		Count	ACSI Score
National Grantees	Regular employment	849	80.4
	Self-employment	45	78.7
	Other reason	1320	73.5
	Did not exit	4687	82.7

State Grantees	Regular employment	932	81.4
	Self-employment	50	81.1
	Other reason	1627	74.0
	Did not exit	5312	83.9
Nationwide	Regular employment	1781	80.9
	Self-employment	95	80.0
	Other reason	2947	73.7
	Did not exit	9999	83.3